APPENDIX C: PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES and PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

1	
2	
3	In the Matter of the
4	CITY OF BUFFALO PLANNING BOARD
5	
6	For Review of
7	DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
8	on Behalf of ELMWOOD CROSSINGS.
9	
10	
11	
12	Public Hearing Minutes, taken
13	pursuant to Public Notice, taken in CITY OF
14	BUFFALO, Niagara Square, Room 901, Buffalo, New
15	York 14202, taken on JULY 15, 2019 commencing at
16	5:05 p.m. Before DARLENE L. JERGE, Notary Public.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS:

JAMES MORRELLS, CHAIRMAN
NADINE MARRERO, CHAIRPERSON
HORACE GIOIA, CHAIRPERSON
CYNTHIA SCHWARTS, CHAIRPERSON
MICHEAL REMBIS, CHAIRPERSON
ANGELA WEBBER, CHAIRPERSON
JASON PAANANEN, CHAIRPERSON
ANDREW MALCOLM, CHAIRPERSON
MICHEAL REMBIS, CHAIRPERSON

7

8

9

10

1

Also Present:

TOM FOX, Ellicott Development

| KELLY THOMPSON, Bergman & Associates

11 DEAN GOWEN, Wendel

12 DARLENE L. JERGE, Court Stenographer

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

MR. ROMANOWSKI: Marc Romanowski, I'm here on behalf of the project development team for Elmwood Crossings this afternoon or now early evening. We are conducting a public hearing on the Draft Generic Environmental Impact

Board approved approximately one month ago.

I'm going to give a brief overview of the project as a whole, critical elements of

statement that we prepared and the Planning

ACR OF WNY

(716) 362-9838

that project. We also have a couple of the key consultants with the project team that will also give some brief summary of the content that's within that very voluminous document that's sitting on your table.

So let's first start overall with the project site. I think we're all familiar with the former Children's Hospital project site. The neighborhood bounded by Elmwood to the west, Bryant to the south and West Utica to the north. And the campus that kind of winds its way through those several blocks.

What the project team is proposing is approximately seven hundred thousand square foot -- total square foot redevelopment.

Much of it is within existing structures.

There's limited demolition that's proposed as part of this development. Much of it is within existing structures, there's also some new structures that are being constructed as well. Primarily along the West Utica side which is currently a surface parking lot and a former I believe VICs store was located

where the townhomes are shown there now.

In general, I'll kind of walk you through this site. For reference, on the south end, that's the main hospital campus. So when you think of Children's Hospital, those are the buildings that you typically associate with that. On Elmwood Avenue, the mixed use project at 451 Elmwood was already approved about a year ago. That project is shown there. Critically, that project was analyzed throughout this document. So whenever we talk about volumes, whether it's parking, traffic, impacts, square footage, residential units, all of that, those are also inclusive of 451 Elmwood, so we haven't excluded that particular project.

As you move eastward into the hospital proper, you see that it's going to be largely apartment units, as well as mixed units with -- in the tower, in the Variety Tower, you're going to have a mixed use of condominiums, hotels -- hotel, and parking.

Then as you move further to the east,

there's going to be some green space
constructed on the site. One of the elements
we heard a lot of during our community
meetings was a discussion on green space.

I'll have Dean Gowen from Wendel speak to
that in more detail. Moving north across
Hodge, one of the earliest projects likely
to see after 451 Elmwood will be the daycare
on Hodge. This can be demolition of a couple
single family residential homes there and
construction of newer, little bit more
fitting buildings for purposes of a daycare.

As you continue to move north, you have the existing parking garage which is part of the analysis here. So the project is assuming utilization of that parking ramp. Right now it has very low utilization after the hospital left. So that's a critical element of the overall analysis and Kelly Thompson from Bergman will speak to parking and traffic issues.

Moving kind of to the northeast, you get into a former parking area. And we're

looking at a multi mixed use retail and apartment type building, with an intent to have a grocery in that particular location. Then next to that to the east are a series of townhomes. All of that is detailed within the -- within the document itself. There are numerous exhibits that go to these elements, as well as all the componentry of that.

To give you some, a little bit more detail on the overall numbers for the project. We talked about seven hundred thousand total square feet. There's approximately 220 apartments. And those take up half of the square footage, so 350 thousand square feet of the seven hundred is apartments. We have a 78 room hotel. Then 27 condominium units, we talked about those in the tower. Then also the twenty townhomes you can see up here on the northeast side of the corner.

So we've covered kind of the overall picture of the site and what the different elements are. Before I move on from that,

1 does anybody have any questions -- the 2 Planning Board that is, have any questions 3 about that overview of the project? 4 HORACE GIOIA: Quick question, how many parking 5 spaces does that garage have? And it's totally controlled by the City still, right? 6 7 MR. ROMANOWSKI: Currently it's still owned by 8 City. We've been in negotiations with the 9 City to acquire it. There's some conditions 10 as part of that transaction that we expect to 11 keep it open to a certain extent for public 12 parking, as well as obviously dedicated to 13 the project site. Total parking spices on 14 the campus including that garage is about 15 750. We expect that we need about 700 is our 16 number, but I'll let Kelly -- I don't want to 17 steal her thunder, I'll let her get into all 18 those finer details she knows those. 19 HORACE GIOIA: Okay. 20 MR. ROMANOWSKI: Any other questions on the 21 overview? 22 MICHAEL REMBIS: The blue -- looks blue to me.

That's a mix of -- the grocery

23

MR. ROMANOWSKI:

store is the intended retail.

MICHAEL REMBIS: Is it going to be a tower or -MR. ROMANOWSKI: That building we're anticipating
being a maximum of five stories, so that's
the current proposal. The townhomes here are
a maximum of three stories.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: So if you recall previously, so the environment study encompasses all, but the individual projects will come back for site plan review?

MR. ROMANOWSKI: Absolutely. Mr. Chairman, that's a great segue into my next section which talks about the approval process.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Okay.

MR. ROMANOWSKI: So the approval process that we envision is exactly as you pointed out. As we get through to develop certain projects, much like we did with 451, we'll come to this Board for site plan approval at a minimum.

We may need some other additional approvals depending on massing. However, what we're trying to accomplish is we're going to be seeking a plan unit development for the site

as a whole.

The purpose of that is to create consistent zoning for the project site.

Right now there's three different zoning districts on the project site. You have N2C, which is a mixed use center, more of a commercialized type zoning. N2E also very similar to N2C, it's a mixed use that is an edge -- neighborhood district edge. And then N2R, there's a couple lots internal primarily around the daycare that is zoned residential.

So what we're looking at is envisioning from a plan development standpoint is that the overall zoning for the site would be essentially an N2C. We would also establish appropriate massing in both locations, in different locations. So, for instance, we'd like some height around the tower but certainly we're not looking for height beyond five stories at West Utica.

So it's envisioning where you are on the project site and setting both standards that are appropriate for that. We talked about

1 the site plan. There will be some subdivision and lot combination that occurs 2 There is a number of little individual 3 here. lots that will be combined into either larger 4 5 parcels just to make the development a little easier to manage. And then the other 6 7 approval that doesn't really impact the city 8 entirely is the brownfield clean-up process 9 that's ongoing on the site. The site is 10 going to be remediated. There was some 11 spills in the past associated with some 12 underground storage tanks. And the site is 13 actually already in the brownfield clean-up 14 program. And we'll obviously bring that to 15 completion as we move forward with the 16 development.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think the Chairman has also summarized I think quite nicely the SEQR process, where we are, the role of the Planning Board. The key issue is that the Planning Board identified early on when they issued the positive declaration for the project, were items such as transportation, impact on

historic resources, surface water.

Since then, and what we've heard as part of the public engagement process that the development team has undergone is certainly concerns about transportation, parking, stormwater run-off. But also there's some concerns about green space, site layout, how is this going to integrate itself into the neighborhoods.

So for that reason we brought the experts Dean and Kelly here to speak to some key issues just to inform the Board a little bit, give you the opportunity to ask questions of them. And then we can move on obviously to the public comment period. So I'm going to start with Dean Gowen from Wendel and he'll talk to overall site issues and landscaping equivalent.

DEAN GOWEN: Dean Gowen, landscape architect with Wendel. Just to start out, one of the key things that Marc just mentioned is a lot of the site is being maintained. The buildings are being preserved. Not a lot of large

scale site opportunities, so what we are determined to do is maximize the benefit of a lot of what's called nooks and crannies, a lot of spaces throughout the site. Integrate them together into a series of -- just to kind of go through and then I'll grab a couple highlighted boards here.

But the overall site really integrates well as a campus down between Bryant and Hodge, then we have a piece up on West Utica. What we would like to do working real closely with the architect, is kind of create a lot of those indoor/ outdoor spaces for not only the residents, but also for the neighborhood and the public to come in. Also looking at some integrated and interconnected green spaces that allow the public to kind of flow through the site from Bryant to Hodge, then we have do have pathways and the ability for people to kind of move north, south, so that you're not bound by, you know, the street block.

Having said that, I will put this up

real quick. This shows kind of a highlighted interconnection of pedestrian movements.

I'll say it kind of loosely pedestrian, bicycle connections, because there will be some ample bicycle widths here. It gets a little narrow coming through some of these spaces, but still it's to try to get people to kind of flow through.

Also, we're showing, highlighting the green that will be available to us to work with. And I will say as a landscape architect sometimes you think the larger space is the hardest to design, a lot of times it's the small intimate so that we can really make use and maximize the benefit. We have shown a number of areas, this was one of the public requests, I don't want to knock the mic over, for focal elements, for public art, for the ability that the community can come through and maybe there's not only interpreted elements, but the focal pieces and sculptures. So those are identified throughout.

And having said that, I will set this down. These highlighted -- I think there's four spaces highlighted here. I'll start north to south in the corner here. The townhouses have kind of an adjoined communal space in-between. This is a rendering of looking down through from north to south. There are also areas along, there was an elevational rise along Bryant as those buildings kind of are a little higher.

Working again with the architects, there's some really dynamic opportunities to create some nice spaces that overlook the street.

One thing that we did notice from a historic picture and kind of borrowed a theme, they had these really beautiful pergola structures that kind of were symbolic of some of the original hospital complex. We have incorporated some of these elements throughout the site to bring kind of the historic reminiscence back to the mix.

And then really highlighting what we'll call the largest of the park opportunities,

the ability for people to go from Bryant to Hodge, through a series of paths. One of the things we picked up from one of the public meetings was, you know, again the availability for people to walk through almost like a sculpture garden. So we don't know what it will look like at this point or what they'll be, but the ability to have areas where the developers and the team can look to some opportunities.

Potential playground spot for the neighborhood. We're calling it either a nature or art focus play area, rather than just put a piece of equipment there and a little open lawn area that people can hang out on. So, without jumping around too much more, again, some focal pieces throughout, some pergola structures as the ability to kind of bring some of the history back. And then last but not least, would be that whole aspect of landscape itself, as many trees as we can put in there, lots of treatment so that this really becomes part of a blend into

1 the neighborhood.

MR. ROMANOWSKI: Thanks, Dean, we appreciate it very much. Just to also really elaborate on one significant issue. Stormwater run-off is something what was a concern, we heard repeatedly. With the landscape plan that's been developed, we're doubling the amount of green space on the site from what was there previously. So not only is the engineering part will help reduce the stormwater run-off, but the level of imperviousness to the site will actually drop by half, from one acre of impervious or green space to two acres; little over two acres.

I also want to clarify one thing. I made a misstatement with respect to the demolition for -- with respect to the day care. That is actually retrofitting those buildings. There's not a demolition there. So I misspoke. Thanks for clarifying it. We'll now turn it over to Kelly, she'll speak to parking and traffic issues.

KELLY THOMPSON: The traffic analysis -- I'm

sorry, my name is Kelly Thompson, I'm with Bergman Associates and we analyzed the existing as well as the full build traffic analysis for this project. We examined the current traffic as it is today based on what is considered a no build or current existing situation.

We found one minor element that may be addressed with some traffic timing adjustments at the intersection of Elmwood and Summer. But in essence it is an operationally very acceptable level service currently. Also, the other thing that we examined on an existing basis is the parking and as Marc had indicated, parking currently is at a very low level in the gallagher ramp. But as you examine all the available parking within not only the ramp but also the other six parking elements that are there, there is more than sufficient parking for any of the development that is as planned.

When then examined in a full build out year, which would be roughly 2022 that was

identified. And again, examined traffic operation ad found all of them to be in considerably acceptable situation with mitigation. That mitigation is to ensure that the connections that are there today, all of these connections that are there to West Utica, Hodge and Elmwood, and all of this circulation and internal traffic sharing that is available, that those connections must be maintained as they are today.

But mitigation wise that we are looking at is some retiming and relocation of the traffic timing cycles, so that we can produce acceptable levels of service at Level C or better at all intersections.

HORACE GIOIA: Can I ask you a question?
KELLY THOMPSON: Certainly.

HORACE GIOIA: Can you explain to the extent
there's exclusion allocation of parking for
each specific use; and then to what extent is
the rest of the people going to try to park?
In other words, the townhouse, do you have
specific parking for the townhouse, do you

1 have specific parking for the apartments or 2 is there not? 3 KELLY THOMPSON: There is six parking areas that 4 are assessed specifically for certain 5 development and the overflow is also identified to go to the Gallagher ramp. 6 As 7 we indicated earlier, the Gallagher ramp is 8 well below its existing capacity of about six 9 hundred thirteen spots. Once these six spots 10 plus the ramp, we provide more than 11 sufficient parking for the amount required. 12 HORACE GIOIA: But for the townhouses there isn't 13 specific -- if I owned a townhouse, do I have 14 a parking spot there or not? 15 KELLY THOMPSON: That's really a question for 16 Tom. 17 Thanks. HORACE GIOIA: Okay. 18 MR. ROMANOWSKI: Tom Fox is going to come up and 19 tell --20 Tell a few jokes. HORACE GIOIA: 21 Tom Fox, Director of Development, TOM FOX: 22 Ellicott Development Company. To clarify 23 site by site, the townhouse specifically,

each townhome, twenty-five hundred square foot townhome, each one has a two car garage inclusive for the residents. Including parking spaces off street here, there's a parking here, parking lot, you can see centrally located.

Each of the individual pieces, you can see the grocery has some parking, there's going to be a new connection into the Gallagher ramp right off this development. The Gallagher ramp we have committed publicly that one floor, the ground floor, approximately 150 spaces would be retained publicly within that ramp. Our reports and our projections for parking do reflect that, that we would retain again the first floor of that ramp as public access for full-time.

Within the other components of the site, you do see some off street parking in this component here with the proposed soon to be constructed building at Elmwood and Bryant. In the back of that, along with some space in this court here. That would be utilized by

these. Primarily these yellow buildings are the old hospital buildings to be rehabbed for residential, are going to utilize the parking within the ramp.

The day care center primarily is going to use some space in here with some overflow into the ramp. In this campus here, the towers, the former Tanner tower, the Variety Tower, the Alfero Building, we're working on as you see in our plans there's an addition of off-street parking within this complex, currently showing about forty vehicles. Those would be dedicated to the condominium units that would be at the top of the Variety tower, the top two floors.

The rest of the building, with the hotel use, any office or retail space in there, and the apartments in the Tanner Tower and Alfero, that would be utilizing the parking ramp as well. And again, those numbers on site around 750 total, we can accommodate that with the site including some surplus.

MR. ROMANOWSKI: Thanks, Tom. Marc Romanowski,

once again. So this is, we felt this addressed an overall presentation of the project itself. We hit on some key issues that were identified in the DGEIS, based on questions by the Planning Board and the public comments we received thus far. If there are any other questions that the board has for the project team as a whole, we're happy to answer them at this time.

CYNTHIA SCHWARTZ: Marc, the only thing, the construction staging, is there as you move through it, I realize there's an sequence of projects. But is there sufficient on site space for construction staging as you're moving through each phase?

MR. ROMANOWSKI: We believe there's sufficient space. As you bring buildings on line, you can use proposed parking areas. We're going to have some open space in and around the former complex areas as we start to demolish. The in-fill buildings that are in the middle there, that will open up some additional space. We can use the ramp for, you know,

parking construction workers, that type of thing. So, we've already planned that out and in fact, some of the details are inside the DGEIS as well.

- CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: In line with that question regarding construction, is there a community advisory committee, is that something that exists and will continue?
- MR. ROMANOWSKI: Yes. There's a community

 advisory committee that was in place by

 Kaleida going back, Cynthia, four years now?

 CYNTHIA SCHWARTZ: At least.
- MR. ROMANOWSKI: Potentially five years ago, that have actively been engaged in this reuse from the point when Kaleida went to sell it and hand it off to the next developer. And that group continues, the Elmwood Crossing teams continues to, in fact, in the DGEIS we scheduled all the meetings we've held with that committee about the project. That is where a lot of this input has come to us.

 When we talked about the importance of green space and the type of uses that would be

1 appropriate, that was all part of the 2 community advisory committee input. 3 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Okay. So now we have the 4 public portion. 5 MR. ROMANOWSKI: Okay. 6 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Are you finished with your 7 presentation? MR. ROMANOWSKI: We are finished unless the Board 8 9 as any other questions? 10 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: The way I understand this is, 11 individuals make comments, there is no 12 response. 13 NADINE MARRERO: These public comments are to be 14 responded to in the Final Generic 15 Environmental Impact Statement. This is for the Board to hear and then take into account 16 17 while drafting the Final Environmental Impact 18 Statement. This is for the Board to hear from the public and the residents, and then 19 20 any substantive comments that are presented 21 too will be responded to in writing. 22 This isn't a site plan? HORACE GIOIA: 23 NADINE MARRERO: This is not a site plan; this is

the environmental impact.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: There's no back and forth and trying to get the answer.

HORACE GIOIA: Just public comments.

- MR. ROMANOWSKI: What we presented today and the document itself, there will be opportunities in the future to deal with individual site plans.
- CYNTHIA SCHWARTZ: The one thing we haven't done is remind people where the document is available. Obviously folks here are aware of it, but as coverage of this continues, where is this document available for the general public.
- NADINE MARRERO: The document is in the Crane
 Library, it is also available on the City of
 Buffalo's website under OSP Environmental
 review. All the documents related to this
 environmental are there. The contents of
 scoping, the draft and final scope and the
 draft environmental impact statement. It's
 also available on our website where we keep
 our agenda. So, it's on two places for the

City of Buffalo's website.

MR. ROMANOWSKI: It's also on the project team's website, Elmwood Crossing's website. We have it there as well.

NADINE MARRERO: So we just take comments now.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Okay. Is there anyone else to be heard on this item? Please step forward, state your name and make your statement.

BILL WISNIEWSKI: My name is Bill Wisniewski, I live on Bryant Street. I just talked around the site today looking at this site plan, the current one. And my concern at this point is the amount of green space, when I look at it, it appears the spot that's the lawn next to the helipad building, requires the demolition of two buildings, which I have not heard addressed yet. I'm not sure with something of this scope why it would require the demolition of any houses on Bryant Street, specifically those.

And I'm skeptical, as I did walk the site, they I did they're doubling the amount

of green space. Is that for the whole site or just around the hospital? Because every time I look at that it, it seems like it's getting smaller. And that's a discussion I have with my neighbors. I think they're ignoring -- where is the public access, public space? I don't see any of this being some place I would be hanging out on a summer day. That would be like me going over to Adam's Mark and playing in the fountain or going to Gates circle and thinking I'm having a picnic. I'm skeptical, or I'm supposed to be naive.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Thank you.

15 BILL WISNIEWSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Is there anyone else to be heard on this item? Please step forward, state your name.

LINDA GELLMAN: Hi, my name is Linda Gellman,

I'm -- if I may I'd like to speak for Eva

Hatchas, she sent me if that's okay. So I

speak for Eva Hatchas first who lives on

Ashland Avenue as well. The number one need

1 as 2 was

as evidenced by the neighborhood survey that was done is for significant public green space.

This neighborhood is a green space desert identified by the City's own master plan as well. The EC -- Elmwood Crossing Plan as put forward is nowhere near adequate in terms of green space. A strip along the sidewalk is not a park for neighbors to share. Real green space is an amenity and would help support housing in this area, especially drawing families.

At the corner of Bryant and Elmwood should be a park, not added square footage on top of 650 thousand, we heard it was closer to seven hundred, that needs to be reviewed. The new building shouldn't be a priority in this project unless there's a document unmet demands after the reuse is completed and filled.

Now, here is my statement. I also am an Elmwood Village homeowner living on Ashland near Bryant, this certainly does impact my

life, this project. As we carefully consider environmental impact on Elmwood Village, this project plan also would include a quality of life impact statement, a liveability impact statement, a bicycle and pedestrian impact statement. This repurposing project can be and should be a model for our region and nation on how to enhance the quality of life in an urban village setting, by fully embracing the principles of smart revitalization to make our communities far more, not less, liveable and sustainable.

One cornerstone of this project blueprint must be about getting people out of cars and maximizing safe and efficient transit. Walking and bicycle options rather than adding another car to an already crowded street. This project plan for the 21st century must be guided by 21st century thinking. To enhance livability, to bring people and families back to our sidewalks and streets; and to give us a place where we can live, work, learn and play for generations to

come.

This must include new and open green spaces and other community amenities that has livability, at the same time can spark a shot in the arm for our local economy.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Thank you. Please step forward and state your name.

BILL SMELTZ: My name is Bill Smeltz, 65 Hodge
Avenue, speaking as an individual resident in
the neighborhood here. I'd just like to note
one thing that was mentioned in the traffic
report as we went through that. If you take
a look at the traffic report, there's a
significant peek volume of traffic in the
neighborhoods serving the grocery store and
the apartments and so forth.

One of the things that was noted in the presentation of the traffic report was that the traffic report or traffic volumes meet appropriate levels, so long as all of the connections that currently exist, including Hodge correction, Utica connection and

connection to Elmwood Avenue remain.

I'd like to ask that the committee look at the actual volumes of internal circulation generated from that and how much traffic would be distributed on to Hodge versus Utica versus Elmwood. The concern from the Hodge Group would be that if this becomes a back door egress for hundreds of, you know, hundreds of cars per hour, that it may be one of the easiest ways to egress the site on to a, you know, relatively small residential street. So, other than that, I think a lot of us are quite happy with the way some of the development has progressed with the work that's going on. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Thank you. Please step forward and state your name.

PEGGY MORIARTY: My name is Peggy Moriarty, and I have been on the pack group for four years and a resident of Oakland Place for 45 years. When we worked with the first developer, we had significant issues. And we as the neighbors, the Bryant Oakland Summer Street

Association, Hodge and Anderson got together and spoke as one group.

We worked as one group. And we decided that this was not going to be a project that was going to be a negative impact. It was something that was going to happen. The hospital has been there for seventy-five years or whatever, and we wanted to see progress. We know it's going to be changed. And we were working very, very hard with the first group and we had problems; that left and then we got the Ellicott Development and Sinatra.

It was a total change of personality, of interest, of listening skills, professional skills. And we worked very, very hard once again, never reporting to the public about any problems because we decided we can work them out with our team between the developers and the neighborhoods. Some of the neighborhoods that are over on Richmond and Anderson, and Ashland -- not Anderson, but Ashland and Norwood had other concerns, but

1 we being under the shadow of the hospital 2 felt we were making a lot of progress. They 3 made a lot of changes. 4 And generally speaking, we are very 5 pleased with the changes that they've made. There will always be little things like green 6 7 space and there will be parking issues 8 because the ramp will become pay, people have 9 to pay to use the ramp, which means a lot of 10 parking is going to come back into the 11 neighborhood. But generally speaking, I just 12 wanted you to know that this was a project we 13 feel very good about and we're happy to see 14 it get going. Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Thank you. Is there anyone 16 else to make a comment on the project? 17 Hearing none, motion to close? 18 HORACE GIOIA: Motion to close. 19 ANDREW MALCOLM: Second. 20 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: All in favor?

(Response of aye from the Board.)

21

22

23

ACR OF WNY (716) 362-9838

1	CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: So.
2	HORACE GIOIA: There's more to come in.
3	MR. ROMANOWSKI: The next phase is the
4	continuation of the public comment period,
5	now it's written comments that will be
6	received until July 29th.
7	CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: July 29th.
8	NADINE MARRERO: July 29th. They can be
9	submitted in writing and mailed, they can be
10	e-mailed to Jason Paananen. Just the two,
11	those are the only two.
12	CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: And that's to
13	NADINE MARRERO: To the City of Buffalo. And if
14	they come to me, it doesn't matter.
15	MR. ROMANOWSKI: And certainly if our project
16	team receives any, we'll pass them along to
17	the City. We've only had a couple questions
18	just about documents.
19	CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: So the comment period ends on
20	the 29th.
21	NADINE MARRERO: Unless it's extended.
22	CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: And then the final draft
23	NADINE MARRERO: The Final Generic Environmental

1 Impact Statement is the Board's document and is the in response to any of the these 2 3 comments, revisions to the Draft 4 Environmental Impact Statement and any new 5 studies that are required to answer those 6 comments. 7 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: It won't go back here, just 8 from this point forward --9 NADINE MARRERO: Part of it is to incorporate any 10 edits that are required from previous 11 That will be the Board's document documents. 12 and that will be issued, there are some 13 guidelines but generally it's forty-five days after the close of public comment period. 14 15 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: There will be a presentation on the final --16 17 NADINE MARRERO: Well, it's the Board, so we will 18 have a discussion. 19 MR. ROMANOWSKI: Certainly we'll help, no public 20 hearing. 21 No, there's no public hearing on NADINE MARRERO: 22 a Final Draft Environmental Impact Statement. 23 And then after that, no sooner than ten days

1 after, the Board will be in a position to 2 issue findings on the project and then could 3 start moving it forward. 4 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: I think that's important for 5 individuals that have spoken here and any others that they understand that basically 6 7 from this point up until the 29th is the 8 comment period. After that, it rests with 9 the Board. 10 MR. ROMANOWSKI: Right. So, the Board will 11 prepare responses with our assistance, 12 provide information regarding the project or 13 otherwise, we had some good questions and 14 comments already today. Those will be part 15 of the FDEIS, of course. And then as Nadine 16 laid out the rest of the process. 17 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Okay. Thank you. 18 Thank you very much. MR. ROMANOWSKI: 19 CHAIRMAN MORRELLS: Appreciate it. 20 21 22

23

1 STATE OF NEW YORK) 2 SS: 3 COUNTY OF ERIE) 4 5 I, DARLENE L. JERGE, a Notary Public in 6 and for the State of New York, County of Erie, DO 7 HEREBY CERTIFY that the minutes of the PLANNING 8 BOARD proceedings were taken down by me in a 9 verbatim manner by means of Machine Shorthand, on 10 JULY 5, 2019. That the MINUTES were then reduced 11 in writing under my direction. That the minutes 12 were taken to be used in the above-entitled 13 action. 14 I further CERTIFY that the 15 above-described transcript constitutes a true and 16 accurate and complete transcript of the minutes 17 taken. 18 19 DARLENE L. JÉRGÈ, 20 Notary Public. 21 22

23

	(710) 0	JE 7000	
< Dates >	< 7 >	16:12,	16:23, 17:4
JULY 15, 2019	700 7:15	16:18	analyzed
1:25	750 21:21	ad 18:2	4:11, 17:2
July 29th	750. 7:15	Adam 27:10	Anderson
34:6, 34:8	78 6:16	added 28:14	32:1, 32:22
July 29th.		adding 29:17	ANDREW 2:9,
3 4 : 7		addition	3 3 : 1 9
JULY 5, 2019	< 9 >	21:10	ANGELA 2:7
37:10	901 1:24	additional	answer 22:9,
		8:20, 22:22	25:3, 35:5
		addressed	anticipating
< 1 >	< A >	17:9, 22:2,	8:3
14202 1:25	ability	26:18	anybody 7:1
150 20:13	12:19,	adequate 28:8	apartment
	13:19,	adjoined 14:5	4:19, 6:2
	15:1, 15:8,	adjustments	apartments
< 2 >	15:18	17:10	6:13, 6:16,
2022 17:23	above-describ	advisory	19:1,
21st 29:18,	ed 37:15	23:7,	21:18,
29:19	above-entitle	23:10, 24:2	30:17
220 6:13	d 37:12	afternoon	appears 26:15
27 6:17	Absolutely	2:22	Appreciate
29th 34:20,	8:11	agenda 25:23	16:2, 36:19
36:7	acceptable	ago 2:26,	appropriate
	17:12,	4:9, 23:13	9:16, 9:23,
	18:3, 18:14	Alfero 21:9,	24:1, 30:21
< 3 >	access 20:17,	21:19	approval
350 6:14	27:6	allocation	8:13, 8:15,
	accommodate	18:19	8:19, 10:7
	21:21	allow 12:17	approvals
< 4 >	accomplish	almost 15:6	8:20
45 31:20	8:22	already 4:8,	approved
451 4:8,	account 24:16	10:13,	2:26, 4:9
4:15, 5:8,	accurate	23:2,	approximately
8:18	37:16	29:17,	2:26, 3:14,
	acquire 7:9	36:14	6:13, 20:13
	acre 16:12	amenities	architect
< 5 >	acres 16:13,	30:3	11:19,
5:05 1:26	16:14	amenity 28:11	12:12,
	across 5:6	amount 16:7,	13:12
	action 37:13	19:11,	architects
< 6 >	actively	26:14,	14:11
65 30:9	23:14	26:23	area 5:23,
650 28:15	actual 31:3	ample 13:5	15:13,
	actually	analysis	15:15,
	10:13,	5:15, 5:19,	28:12

areas 13:16,		BOARD 1:7,	17:6, 17:22
14:8, 15:9,		2:1, 2:26,	Building 6:2,
19:3,	< B >	7:2, 8:19,	8:3, 20:21,
22:18,	back 8:9,	10:19,	21:9,
22:20	14:21,	10:20,	21:16,
arm 30:5	15:19,	11:12,	26:16,
around 9:11,	20:22,	22:5, 22:7,	28:17
9:18,	23:11,	24:8,	buildings
15:16,	25:2,	24:16,	4:6, 5:12,
21:21,	29:21,	24:18,	11:22,
22:19,	31:7,	35:1,	14:10,
26:11, 27:2	33:10, 35:7	35:11,	16:19,
art 13:19,	based 17:5,	35:17,	21:1, 21:2,
15:13	22:4	36:1, 36:9,	22:17,
Ashland	basically	36:10, 37:8	22:21,
27:23,	36:6	Board. 33:22	26:17
28:22,	basis 17:14	boards 12:7	
32:22,	beautiful	borrowed	
32:23	14:16	14:15	< C >
aspect 15:21	become 33:8	bound 12:21	call 14:23
assessed 19:4	becomes	bounded 3:9	called 12:3
assistance	15:23, 31:7	brief 2:27,	calling 15:12
36:11	Behalf 1:15,	3:3	campus 3:11,
associate 4:7	2:21	bring 10:14,	4:4, 7:14,
associated	believe 3:23,	14:20,	12:9, 21:7
10:11	22:16	15:19,	capacity 19:8
Associates	below 19:8	22:17,	car 20:2,
2:15, 17:2	benefit 12:2,	29:20	29:17
Association	13:15	brought 11:10	care 16:18,
32:1	Bergman 2:15,	brownfield	21:5
assuming 5:16	5:20, 17:2	10:8, 10:13	carefully
availability	better 18:15	Bryant 3:10,	29:1
15:5	beyond 9:19	12:9,	cars 29:15,
available	bicycle 13:4,	12:18,	31:9
13:10,	13:5, 29:5,	14:9, 15:1,	center 9:6,
17:17,	29:16	20:21,	21:5
18:9,	Bill 26:10,	26:11,	centrally
25:11,	27:15, 30:9	26:20,	20:6
25:13,	bit 5:11,	28:13,	century 29:19
25:16,	6:9, 11:13	28:23,	certain 7:11,
25:22	blend 15:23	31:23	8:17, 19:4
Avenue 4:7,	block 12:22	Buffalo 1:7,	Certainly
27:23,	blocks 3:12	1:24,	9:19, 11:4,
30:10, 31:1	blue 7:22	25:17,	18:17,
aware 25:11	blueprint	26:1, 34:13	28:23,
aye 33:22	29:14	build 17:3,	34:15,

35:19	26:1, 28:5,	29:11	17:6
CERTIFY 37:7,	34:13,	community	consistent
37:14	34:17	5:3, 13:19,	9:3
Chairman 2:2,	clarify	23:6, 23:9,	constitutes
8:11, 10:17	16:15,	24:2, 30:3	37:15
CHAIRMAN	19:22	Company 19:22	constructed
MORRELLS	clarifying	complete	3:20, 5:2,
8:7, 8:14,	16:20	37:16	20:21
23:5, 24:3,	clean-up	completed	construction
24:6,	10:8, 10:13	28:19	5:11,
24:10,	close 33:17,	completion	22:11,
25:2, 26:6,	33:18,	10:15	22:14,
27:14,	35:14	complex	23:1, 23:6
27:16,	closely 12:11	14:18,	consultants
30:7,	closer 28:15	21:11,	3:2
31:16,	combination	22:20	content 3:4
33:15,	10:2	component	contents
3 3 : 2 0 ,	combined 10:4	20:20	25:19
34:1, 34:7,	coming 13:6	componentry	continuation
34:12,	commencing	6:8	3 4 : 4
34:19,	1:25	components	continue
34:22,	comment	20:18	5:13, 23:8
35:7,	11:15,	concern 16:5,	continues
35:15,	33:16,	26:13, 31:6	23:17,
36:4,	34:4,	concerns	23:18,
36:17,	34:19,	11:5, 11:7,	25:12
36:19	35:14, 36:8	32:23	controlled
CHAIRPERSON	comments	conditions	7:6
2:3, 2:4,	22:6,	7:9	corner 6:20,
2:5, 2:6,	24:11,	condominium	14:4, 28:13
2:7, 2:8,	24:13,	6:17, 21:13	cornerstone
2:9, 2:10	24:20,	condominiums	29:13
change 32:14	25:4, 26:5,	4:22	correction
changed 32:9	34:5, 35:3,	conducting	30:23
changes 33:3,	35:6, 36:14	2:23	County 37:3,
3 3 : 5	commercialize	connection	37:6
Children 3:8,	d 9:7	20:9,	couple 3:1,
4:5	committed	30:23, 31:1	5:9, 9:10,
circle 27:11	20:11	connections	12:7, 34:17
circulation	committee	13:4, 18:5,	course 36:15
18:8, 31:3	23:7,	18:6, 18:9,	Court 2:17,
City 1:7,	23:10,	30:22	20:23
1:23, 7:6,	23:20,	consider 29:1	coverage
7:8, 7:9,	24:2, 31:2	considerably	25:12
10:7,	communal 14:5	18:3	covered 6:21
25:16,	communities	considered	Crane 25:15

crannies 12:3	32:18	DGEIS 22:4,	during 5:3
create 9:2,	declaration	23:4, 23:18	dynamic 14:12
12:12,	10:22	different	
14:12	dedicated	6:22, 9:4,	
critical	7:12, 21:13	9:17	< E >
2:28, 5:18	demands 28:19	direction	e-mailed
Critically	demolish	37:11	3 4 : 1 0
4:10	22:20	Director	earlier 19:7
Crossing	demolition	19:21	earliest 5:7
23:17,	3:17, 5:9,	discussion	early 2:22,
26:3, 28:7	16:17,	5:4, 27:4,	10:21
Crossings	16:19,	35:18	easier 10:6
1:15, 2:22	26:16,	distributed	easiest 31:10
<pre>crowded 29:17</pre>	26:20	31:5	east 4:23,
<pre>current 8:5,</pre>	depending	district 9:9	6:4
17:5, 17:6,	8:21	districts 9:5	eastward 4:17
26:13	desert 28:5	document 3:5,	EC 28:6
Currently	design 13:13	4:11, 6:6,	economy 30:5
3:22, 7:7,	detail 5:6,	25:6,	ed 14:2
17:13,	6:10	25:10,	edge 9:9
17:15,	detailed 6:5	25:13,	edits 35:10
21:12,	details 7:18,	25:15,	efficient
30:22	23:3	28:18,	29:15
cycles 18:13	determined	35:1, 35:11	egress 31:8,
CYNTHIA 2:5,	12:2	documents	31:10
22:10,	develop 8:17	25:18,	either 10:4,
23:11,	developed	34:18,	15:12
23:12, 25:9	16:7	35:11	elaborate
	developer	done 25:9,	16:3
	23:16,	28:2	element 5:19,
< D >	31:21	door 31:8	17:8
DARLENE 1:26,	developers	doubling	elements
2:17, 37:5,	15:9, 32:19	16:7, 26:23	2:28, 5:2,
37:20	Development	down 12:9,	6:7, 6:23,
day 16:17,	2:14, 2:21,	14:2, 14:7,	13:18,
21:5, 27:9	3:18, 8:23,	37:8	13:21,
daycare 5:8,	9:13, 10:5,	Draft 1:13,	14:19,
5:12, 9:11	10:16,	2:24,	17:19
days 35:13,	11:4,	25:20,	elevational
35:23	17:21,	25:21,	14:9
deal 25:7	19:5,	34:22,	Ellicott
Dean 2:16,	19:21,	35:3, 35:22	2:14,
5:5, 11:11,	19:22,	drafting	19:22,
11:16,	20:10,	24:17	32:12
11:19, 16:2	31:14,	drawing 28:12	Elmwood 1:15,
decided 32:3,	32:12	drop 16:12	2:22, 3:9,

4:7, 4:8,	Erie 37:3,	28:12,	6:14, 28:14
4:15, 5:8,	37:6	29:21	former 3:8,
17:10,	especially	family 5:10	3:23, 5:23,
18:7,	28:12	far 22:6,	21:8, 22:20
20:21,	essence 17:11	29:11	forth 25:2,
23:17,	essentially	favor 33:20	30:17
26:3, 28:6,	9:15	FDEIS 36:15	forty 21:12
28:13,	establish	feel 33:13	forty-five
28:22,	9:15	feet 6:12,	35:13
29:2, 31:1,	Eva 27:20,	6:15	forward
31:6	27:22	felt 22:1,	10:15,
embracing	evening 2:23	3 3 : 2	26:8,
29:10	evidence 28:1	few 19:20	27:17,
encompasses	exactly 8:16	filled 28:20	28:7, 30:8,
8:8	examine 17:17	Final 24:14,	31:17,
end 4:4	examined	24:17,	35:8, 36:3
ends 34:19	17:4,	25:20,	found 17:8,
engaged 23:14	17:14,	34:22,	18:2
engagement	17:22, 18:1	34:23,	fountain
11:3	excluded 4:16	35:16,	27:10
engineering	exclusion	35:22	four 14:3,
16:9	18:19	findings 36:2	23:11,
enhance 29:8,	exhibits 6:7	finer 7:18	31:19
29:20	exist 30:22	finished	Fox 2:14,
ensure 18:4	existing	24:6, 24:8	19:18,
entirely 10:8	3:16, 3:19,	first 3:6,	19:21
environment	5:14, 17:3,	20:16,	full 17:3,
8:8	17:6,	27:22,	17:22
Environmental	17:14, 19:8	31:21,	full-time
1:13, 2:24,	exists 23:8	32:11	20:17
24:15,	expect 7:10,	fitting 5:12	fully 29:9
24:17,	7:15	five 8:4,	future 25:7
25:1,	experts 11:11	9:20, 23:13	
25:17,	explain 18:18	floor 20:12,	
25:19,	extended	20:16	< G >
25:21,	34:21	floors 21:15	Gallagher
29:2,	extent 7:11,	flow 12:17,	17:16,
34:23,	18:18,	13:8	19:6, 19:7,
35:4, 35:22	18:20	focal 13:18,	20:10,
envision 8:16		13:21,	20:11
envisioning		15:17	garage 5:14,
9:12, 9:21	< F >	focus 15:13	7:5, 7:14,
equipment	fact 23:3,	folks 25:11	20:2
15:14	23:18	foot 3:15,	garden 15:6
equivalent	<pre>familiar 3:7</pre>	20:2	Gates 27:11
11:18	families	footage 4:13,	Gellman 27:19

	1	I	1
general 4:2,	28:10,	height 9:18,	21:2, 27:2,
25:13	30:2, 33:6	9:19	32:7, 33:1
generally	grocery 6:3,	held 23:19	hotel 4:22,
33:4,	7:23, 20:8,	helipad 26:16	6:16, 21:16
33:11,	30:16	help 16:10,	hotels 4:22
35:13	ground 20:12	28:11,	hour 31:9
generated	Group 23:17,	35:19	houses 26:20
3 1 : 4	31:7,	HEREBY 37:7	housing 28:11
generations	31:19,	high 14:2	hundred 3:14,
29:23	32:2, 32:3,	higher 14:10	6:11, 6:15,
Generic 1:13,	3 2 : 1 1	highlighted	19:9, 20:1,
2:24,	guided 29:19	12:7, 13:1,	28:16
24:14,	guidelines	14:3	hundreds
3 4 : 2 3	35:13	highlighting	31:8, 31:9
gets 13:5		13:9, 14:22	
getting 27:4,		historic	
29:14	< H >	11:1,	< I >
GIOIA 2:4,	half 6:14,	14:15,	I will 12:23,
7:4, 7:19,	16:12	14:21	13:11, 14:1
18:16,	hand 23:16	history 15:19	identified
18:18,	hang 15:15	hit 22:3	10:21,
19:12,	hanging 27:8	Hodge 5:7,	13:22,
19:17,	happen 32:6	5:9, 12:10,	18:1, 19:6,
19:20,	happy 22:9,	12:18,	22:4, 28:5
24:22,	31:13,	15:2, 18:7,	if you 8:7
25:4,	3 3 : 1 3	30:9,	ignoring 27:6
33:18, 34:2	hard 32:10,	30:23,	Impact 1:13,
give 2:27,	32:16	31:5, 31:6,	2:24, 10:7,
3:3,6:9,	hardest 13:13	3 2 : 1	10:23,
11:13,	Hatchas	homeowner	24:15,
29:22	27:21,	28:22	24:17,
Gowen 2:16,	27:22	homes 5:10	25:1,
5:5, 11:16,	he'll 11:17	HORACE 2:4,	25:21,
11:19	hear 24:16,	7:4, 7:19,	28:23,
grab 12:6	24:18	18:16,	29:2, 29:4,
great 8:12	heard 5:3,	18:18,	29:5, 32:5,
<pre>green 5:1,</pre>	11:2, 16:5,	19:12,	35:1, 35:4,
5:4, 11:7,	26:7,	19:17,	35:22
12:16,	26:17,	19:20,	impacts 4:13
13:10,	27:17,	24:22,	impervious
16:8,	28:15	25:4,	16:13
16:13,	Hearing 1:22,	33:18, 34:2	imperviousnes
23:22,	2:23,	Hospital 3:8,	s 16:11
26:14,	33:17,	4:4, 4:5,	importance
27:1, 28:2,	35:20,	4:17, 5:18,	23:22
28:4, 28:8,	35:21	14:18,	important
•	I	1	1 -

36:4	32:15	keep 7:11,	largest 14:23
in-between	internal	25:22	last 15:20
14:6	9:10, 18:8,	KELLY 2:15,	lawn 15:15,
in-fill 22:21	31:3	5:19, 7:16,	26:15
in. 12:15	interpreted	11:11,	layout 11:7
include 29:3,	13:21	16:21,	learn 29:23
30:2	intersection	16:23,	least 15:20,
Including	17:10	17:1,	23:12
7:14, 20:3,	intersections	18:17,	left 5:18,
21:22,	18:15	19:3, 19:15	32:11
30:22	intimate	key 3:2,	less 29:12
inclusive	13:14	10:20,	Level 16:11,
4:15, 20:3	issue 10:20,	11:12,	17:12,
incorporate	16:4, 36:2	11:20, 22:3	17:16,
35:9	issued 10:21,	kind 3:11,	18:14
incorporated	35:12	4:2, 5:22,	levels 18:14,
14:19	issues 5:21,	6:21, 12:6,	30:21
indicated	11:12,	12:12,	Library 25:16
17:15, 19:7	11:17,	12:17,	life 29:1,
individual	16:22,	12:20,	29:4, 29:8
8:9, 10:3,	22:3,	13:1, 13:3,	light 14:2
20:7, 25:7,	31:22, 33:7	13:8, 14:5,	likely 5:7
30:10	item 26:7,	14:10,	limited 3:17
individuals	27:17	14:15,	Linda 27:19
24:11, 36:5	items 10:23	14:17,	line 22:17,
indoor/ 12:13	itself 6:6,	14:20,	23:5
inform 11:12	11:8,	15:19	listening
information	15:21,	knock 13:17	3 2 : 1 5
36:12	22:3, 25:6	knows 7:18	little 5:11,
input 23:21,			6:9, 10:3,
24:2	_		10:5,
inside 23:3	< J >	< L >	11:12,
instance 9:17	JAMES 2:2	L. 1:26,	13:6,
Integrate	Jason 2:8,	2:17, 37:5,	14:10,
11:8, 12:4	3 4 : 1 0	37:20	15:15,
integrated	JERGE 1:26,	laid 36:16	16:14, 33:6
12:16	2:17, 37:5,	landscape	livability
integrates	37:20	11:19,	29:20, 30:4
12:8	jokes 19:20	13:11,	live 26:11,
intended 8:1	jumping 15:16	15:21, 16:6	29:23
intent 6:2		landscaping	liveability
interconnecte	. 77	11:18	29:4
d 12:16	< K >	large 11:23	liveable
interconnecti	Kaleida	largely 4:18	29:12
on 13:2	23:11,	larger 10:4,	lives 27:22
interest	23:15	13:12	living 28:22

	(/ -		
local 30:5	3 3 : 1 9	minimum 8:19	24:13,
located 3:23,	manage 10:6	minor 17:8	24:23,
20:6	manner 37:9	MINUTES 1:22,	25:15,
location 6:3	Marc 2:20,	37:7,	26:5, 34:8,
locations	11:21,	37:10,	34:13,
9:16, 9:17	17:15,	37:11,	34:21,
long 30:21	21:23,	37:16	34:23,
look 15:7,	22:10	misspoke	35:9,
15:10,	Mark 27:10	16:20	35:17,
26:14,	MARRERO 2:3,	misstatement	35:21,
27:3,	24:13,	16:16	36:15
30:14, 31:2	24:23,	mitigation	naive 27:13
<pre>looking 6:1,</pre>	25:15,	18:4, 18:11	name 17:1,
9:12, 9:19,	26:5, 34:8,	mix 7:23,	26:8,
12:15,	34:13,	14:21	26:10,
14:7,	34:21,	mixed 4:8,	27:18,
18:11,	34:23,	4:19, 4:21,	27:19,
26:12	35:9,	6:1, 9:6,	30:8, 30:9,
looks 7:22	35:17,	9:8	31:17,
loosely 13:3	35:21	model 29:7	31:18
lot 3:22,	massing 8:21,	month 2:26	narrow 13:6
5:3, 10:2,	9:16	Moriarty	nation 29:8
11:21,	master 28:5	31:18	nature 15:13
11:23,	Matter 1:5,	MORRELLS 2:2	near 28:7,
12:3, 12:4,	3 4 : 1 4	Motion 33:17,	28:23
12:12,	maximize	3 3 : 1 8	need 7:15,
13:13,	12:2, 13:15	move 4:17,	8:20, 27:23
20:5,	maximizing	4:23, 5:13,	needs 28:16
23:21,	29:15	6:23,	negative 32:5
31:12,	maximum 8:4,	10:15,	negotiations
33:2, 33:3,	8:6	11:14,	7:8
3 3 : 9	means 33:9,	12:20,	neighborhood
lots 9:10,	3 7 : 9	22:11	3:9, 9:9,
10:4, 15:22	meet 30:20	movement 13:2	12:14,
low 5:17,	meetings 5:4,	Moving 5:6,	15:12,
17:16	15:4, 23:19	5:22,	16:1, 28:1,
	MEMBERS 2:1	22:15, 36:3	28:4,
	mentioned	multi 6:1	30:11,
< M >	11:21,		3 3 : 1 1
Machine 37:9	30:12		neighborhoods
mailed 34:9	mic 13:18	< N >	11:9,
main 4:4	MICHAEL 7:22,	N2C 9:5, 9:8,	30:16,
maintained	8:2	9:15	32:20,
11:22,	MICHEAL 2:6,	N2E 9:7	3 2 : 2 1
18:10	2:10	N2R 9:10	neighbors
MALCOLM 2:9,	middle 22:21	Nadine 2:3,	27:5,

28:10,	10:14,	12:1,	16:22,
31:23	11:15,	14:12,	17:14,
New 1: 24,	25:11	14:23,	17:15,
3:20, 20:9,	occurs 10:2	15:10, 25:6	17:17,
28:17,	off-street	opportunity	17:19,
30:2, 35:4,	21:11	11:13	17:20,
37:1, 37:6	office 21:17	options 29:16	18:19,
newer 5:11	Okay 7:19,	original	18:23,
next 6:4,	8:14,	14:18	19:1, 19:3,
8:12,	19:17,	OSP 25:17	19:11,
23:16,	24:3, 24:5,	others 36:6	19:14,
26:15, 34:3	26:6,	otherwise	20:4, 20:5,
Niagara 1:24	27:21,	36:13	20:8,
nice 14:13	36:17	outdoor 12:13	20:15,
nicely 10:18	old 21:2	overall 3:6,	20:19,
none 33:17	Once 19:9,	5:19, 6:10,	21:3,
nooks 12:3	22:1, 32:16	6:21, 9:14,	21:11,
north 3:11,	One 2:26,	11:17,	21:19,
5:6, 5:13,	5:2, 5:7,	12:8, 22:2	22:18,
12:20,	11:20,	overflow	23:1, 33:7,
14:4, 14:7	13:16,	19:5, 21:6	3 3 : 1 0
northeast	14:14,	overlook	Part 3:18,
5:22, 6:19	15:2, 15:3,	14:13	5:14, 7:10,
Norwood 32:23	16:4,	overview	11:2,
Notary 1:26,	16:12,	2:27, 7:3,	15:23,
37:5, 37:21	16:15,	7:21	16:10,
note 30:11	17:8, 20:2,	own 28:5	24:1, 35:9,
noted 30:18	20:12,	owned 7:7,	36:14
Notice 1:23,	25:9,	19:13	particular
14:14	27:23,		4:16, 6:3
nowhere 28:7	29:13,		pass 34:16
number 7:16,	30:12,	< P >	past 10:11
10:3,	30:18,	p.m. 1:26	paths 15:2
13:16,	31:9, 32:2,	Paananen 2:8,	pathways
27:23	3 2 : 3	3 4 : 1 0	12:19
numbers 6:10,	one. 26:13	pack 31:19	pay 33:8,
21:20	ongoing 10:9	parcels 10:5	3 3 : 9
numerous 6:7	open 7:11,	park 14:23,	pedestrian
	15:15,	18:21,	13:2, 13:3,
_	22:19,	28:9, 28:14	29:5
< 0 >	22:22, 30:2	parking 3:22,	peek 30:15
Oakland	operation	4:13, 4:22,	Peggy 31:18
31:20,	18:2	5:14, 5:16,	people 12:20,
31:23	operationally	5:20, 5:23,	13:7, 15:1,
Obviously	17:12	7:4, 7:12,	15:5,
7:12,	opportunities	7:13, 11:5,	15:15,

18:21,	25:8	problems	22:13
25:10,	play 15:13,	32:11,	proper 4:18
29:14,	29:23	3 2 : 1 8	proposal 8:5
29:21, 33:8	playground	proceedings	proposed
per 31:9	15:11	37:8	3:17,
pergola	playing 27:10	process 8:13,	20:20,
14:17,	Please 26:7,	8:15, 10:8,	22:18
15:18	27:17,	10:18,	proposing
<pre>period 11:15,</pre>	30:7, 31:16	11:3, 36:16	3:13
34:4,	pleased 33:5	produce 18:13	provide
34:19,	plus 19:10	professional	19:10,
35:14, 36:8	point 15:7,	32:15	36:12
personality	23:15,	program 10:14	Public 1:22,
32:14	26:13,	progress	1:23, 1:26,
phase 22:15,	35:8, 36:7	32:9, 33:2	2:23, 7:11,
3 4 : 3	pointed 8:16	progressed	11:3,
picked 15:3	portion 24:4	31:14	11:15,
picnic 27:12	position 36:1	project 2:21,	12:15,
picture 6:22,	positive	2:28, 3:1,	12:17,
14:15	10:22	3:2, 3:7,	13:17,
<pre>piece 12:10,</pre>	Potential	3:8, 3:13,	13:18,
15:14	15:11	4:8, 4:9,	15:3,
<pre>pieces 13:21,</pre>	Potentially	4:10, 4:16,	20:17,
15:17, 20:7	23:13	5:15, 6:11,	22:6, 24:4,
Place 23:10,	prepare 36:11	7:3, 7:13,	24:13,
27:8,	prepared 2:25	9:3, 9:5,	24:19,
29:22,	Present 2:13	9:22,	25:4,
31:20	presentation	10:22,	25:14,
places 25:23	22:2, 24:7,	17:4, 22:3,	27:6, 27:7,
Plan 8:10,	30:19,	22:8,	28:2,
8:19, 8:23,	35:15	23:20,	32:17,
9:13, 10:1,	presented	26:2,	3 4 : 4 ,
16:6,	24:20, 25:5	28:18,	35:14,
24:22,	preserved	29:1, 29:3,	35:19,
24:23,	11:23	29:6,	35:21,
26:12,	previous	29:13,	37:5, 37:21
28:6, 28:7,	35:10	29:18,	publicly
29:3, 29:18	previously	3 2 : 4 ,	20:11,
planned	8:7, 16:9	3 3 : 1 2 ,	20:14
17:21, 23:2	Primarily	33:16,	purpose 9:2
PLANNING 1:7,	3:21, 9:10,	34:15,	purposes 5:12
2:1, 2:25,	21:1, 21:5	36:2, 36:12	pursuant 1:23
7:2, 10:19,	principles	projections	put 12:23,
10:20,	29:10	20:15	15:14,
22:5, 37:7	priority	projects 5:7,	15:22, 28:7
plans 21:10,	28:17	8:9, 8:17,	

(716) 362-9838				
	15:23,	13:17	8:10, 25:18	
< Q >	16:3, 19:15	require 26:19	reviewed	
quality 29:3,	reason 11:10	required	28:16	
29:8	recall 8:7	19:11,	revisions	
question 7:4,	received	35:5, 35:10	35:3	
18:16,	22:6, 34:6	requires	revitalizatio	
19:15, 23:5	receives	26:16	n 29:11	
questions	3 4 : 1 6	resident	Richmond	
7:1, 7:2,	redevelopment	30:10,	32:21	
7:20,	3:15	3 1 : 2 0	rise 14:9	
11:14,	reduce 16:10	residential	role 10:19	
22:5, 22:7,	reduced 37:10	4:14, 5:10,	ROMANOWSKI	
24:9,	reference 4:3	9:11, 21:3,	2:20, 7:7,	
34:17,	reflect 20:15	31:11	7:20, 7:23,	
36:13	regarding	residents	8:3, 8:11,	
Quick 7:4,	23:6, 36:12	12:14,	8:15, 16:2,	
13:1	region 29:7	20:3, 24:19	19:18,	
quite 10:18,	rehabbed 21:2	resources	21:23,	
31:13	related 25:18	11:1	22:16,	
	relatively	respect	23:9,	
	31:11	16:16,	23:13,	
< R >	relocation	16:17	24:5, 24:8,	
<pre>ramp 5:16,</pre>	18:12	responded	25:5, 26:2,	
17:16,	remain 31:1	24:14,	34:3,	
17:18,	REMBIS 2:6,	24:21	34:15,	
19:6, 19:7,	2:10, 7:22,	Response	35:19,	
19:10,	8:2	24:12,	36:10,	
20:10,	remediated	33:22, 35:2	36:18	
20:11,	10:10	responses	Room 1:24,	
20:14,	remind 25:10	36:11	6:16	
20:17,	reminiscence	rest 18:21,	roughly 17:23	
21:4, 21:7,	14:21	21:16,	run-off 11:6,	
21:20,	rendering	36:16	16:4, 16:10	
22:23,	14:6	rests 36:8		
33:8, 33:9	repeatedly	retail 6:1,		
rather 15:13,	16:6	8:1, 21:17	< S >	
29:16	report 30:13,	retain 20:16	s. 13:2	
Real 12:11,	30:14,	retained	safe 29:15	
13:1, 28:10	30:19,	20:13	scale 12:1	
realize 22:12	30:20	retiming	scheduled	
really 10:7,	reporting	18:12	23:19	
12:8,	32:17	retrofitting	SCHWARTS 2:5	
13:15,	reports 20:14	16:18	SCHWARTZ	
14:12,	repurposing	reuse 23:14,	22:10,	
14:16,	29:6	28:19	23:12, 25:9	
14:22,	requests	Review 1:11,	scope 25:20,	

26.10	6.10		20.10
26:19	6:19	skeptical	30:10,
scoping 25:20	sidewalk 28:9	26:22,	33:4, 33:11
sculpture	sidewalks	27:12	specific
15:6	29:21	skills 32:15,	18:20,
sculptures	significant	3 2 : 1 6	18:23,
13:22	16:4, 28:2,	small 13:14,	19:1, 19:13
Second 33:19	30:15,	31:11	specifically
section 8:12	31:22	smaller 27:4	19:4,
seeking 8:23	similar 9:8	smart 29:10	19:23,
seems 27:3	Sinatra 32:13	Smeltz 30:9	26:21
segue 8:12	single 5:10	sometimes	spices 7:13
sell 23:15	site 3:7,	13:12	spills 10:11
sent 27:21	3:9, 4:3,	soon 20:20	spoke 32:2
SEQR 10:18	5:2, 6:22,	sooner 35:23	spoken 36:5
sequence	7:13, 8:10,	sorry 17:1	spot 15:11,
22:12	8:19, 8:23,	south 3:10,	19:14,
series 6:4,	9:3, 9:5,	4:4, 12:20,	26:15
12:5, 15:2	9:14, 9:22,	14:4, 14:7	spots 19:9
service	10:1, 10:9,	space 5:1,	Square 1:24,
17:12,	10:12,	5:4, 11:7,	3:14, 3:15,
18:14	11:7,	13:13,	4:13, 6:12,
serving 30:16	11:17,	14:6, 16:8,	6:14, 6:15,
set 14:1	11:22,	16:13,	20:1, 28:14
setting 9:22,	12:1, 12:4,	20:22,	SS 37:2
29:9	12:8,	21:6,	staging
seven 3:14,	12:18,	21:17,	22:11,
6:11, 6:15,	14:20,	22:14,	22:14
28:16	16:8,	22:17,	standards
seventy-five	16:11,	22:19,	9:22
32:7	19:23,	22:23,	standpoint
several 3:12	20:18,	23:23,	9:13
shadow 33:1	21:21,	26:14,	start 3:6,
share 28:10	21:22,	27:1, 27:7,	11:16,
sharing 18:8	22:13,	28:3, 28:4,	11:20,
she'll 16:21	24:22,	28:8,	14:3,
Shorthand	24:23,	28:10, 33:7	22:20, 36:3
37:9	25:7,	spaces 7:5,	State 26:8,
shot 30:4	26:12,	12:4,	27:18,
shouldn't	26:23,	12:13,	30:8,
28:17	27:1, 31:10	12:17,	31:17,
showing 13:9,	sitting 3:5	13:7, 14:3,	37:1, 37:6
21:12	situation	14:13,	Statement
\mathtt{shown} 4:1,	17:7, 18:3	20:4,	1:13, 2:25,
4:10, 13:16	six 17:19,	20:13, 30:3	24:15,
shows 13:1	19:3, 19:8,	spark 30:4	24:18,
side 3:21,	19:9	speaking	25:21,

26:9,	22:13,	36:17	top 21:14,
28:21,	22:16	Thanks 16:2,	21:15,
29:4, 29:5,	summarized	16:20,	28:15
29:6, 35:1,	10:17	19:17,	Total 3:15,
35:4, 35:22	summary 3:3	21:23	6:12, 7:13,
steal 7:17		theme 14:16	21:21,
Stear /.1/ Stenographer	Summer 17:11,		32:14
	27:8, 31:23	they'll 15:8 they've 33:5	totally 7:6
2:17	support 28:11		_
step 26:7,	supposed	thinking	Tower 4:20,
27:17,	27:12	27:11,	6:18, 8:2,
30:7, 31:16	surface 3:22,	29:20	9:18, 21:8,
storage 10:12	11:1	thirteen 19:9	21:9,
store 3:23,	surplus 21:22	THOMPSON	21:15,
8:1, 30:16	survey 28:1	2:15, 5:20,	21:18
stories 8:4,	sustainable	16:23,	towers 21:8
8:6, 9:20	29:12	17:1,	townhome
Stormwater	symbolic	18:17,	20:1, 20:2
11:6, 16:4,	14:17	19:3, 19:15	townhomes
16:10		thousand	4:1, 6:5,
Street 12:21,		3:14, 6:12,	6:18, 8:5
14:13,	< T >	6:15, 28:15	townhouse
20:4,	table 3:5	three 8:6,	18:22,
20:19,	talked 6:11,	9:4	18:23,
26:11,	6:17, 9:23,	throughout	19:13,
26:20,	23:22,	12:4,	19:23
29:18,	26:11	13:23,	townhouses
31:12,	talks 8:13	14:20,	14:5, 19:12
3 1 : 2 3	tanks 10:12	15:17	traffic 4:13,
streets 29:22	Tanner 21:8,	thunder 7:17	5:21,
strip 28:8	21:18	timing 17:9,	16:22,
structures	team 2:21,	18:13	16:23,
3:16, 3:19,	3:2, 3:13,	to see 5:8,	17:3, 17:5,
3:20,	11:4, 15:9,	32:8, 33:13	17:9, 18:1,
14:17,	22:8, 26:2,	today 17:5,	18:8,
15:18	32:19,	18:5,	18:13,
studies 35:5	3 4 : 1 6	18:10,	30:12,
study 8:8	teams 23:17	25:5,	30:14,
subdivision	ten 35:23	26:12,	30:15,
10:2	terms 28:8	36:14	30:19,
submitted	Thank you	together	30:20, 31:4
3 4 : 9	27:14,	12:5, 32:1	transaction
substantive	27:15,	Tom 2:14,	7:10
24:20	30:6, 30:7,	19:16,	transcript
sufficient	31:16,	19:18,	37:15,
17:20,	33:14,	19:21,	37:16
19:11,	33:15,	21:23	transit 29:16

transportatio	urban 29:9	we were	Within 3:4,
n 10:23,	uses 23:23	32:10, 33:2	3:16, 3:19,
11:5	Utica 3:10,	WEBBER 2:7	6:5, 6:6,
treatment	3:21, 9:20,	website	17:18,
15:22	12:10,	25:17,	20:14,
trees 15:21	18:7,	25:22,	20:18,
true 37:15	30:23, 31:5	26:1, 26:3	21:4, 21:11
try 13:7,	utilization	Wendel 2:16,	without 15:16
18:21	5:16, 5:17	5:5, 11:17,	words 18:22
trying 8:22,	utilize 21:3	11:20	work 13:10,
25:3	utilized	West 3:10,	29:23,
turn 16:21	20:23	3:21, 9:20,	31:14,
twenty 6:18	utilizing	12:10, 18:7	32:18
twenty-five	21:19	whatever 32:8	worked 31:21,
20:1		whenever 4:12	32:3, 32:16
two 16:13,		whether 4:12	workers 23:1
16:14,	< V >	whole 2:28,	Working
20:2,	Variety 4:20,	9:1, 15:20,	12:11,
21:15,	21:8, 21:14	22:8, 27:1	14:11,
25:23,	vehicles	widths 13:5	21:9, 32:10
26:17,	21:12	will 3:3,	writing
34:10,	verbatim 37:9	5:8, 5:20,	24:21,
34:11	versus 31:5,	8:9, 10:1,	34:9, 37:11
type 6:2,	31:6	10:4, 13:4,	written 34:5
9:7, 23:1,	Vics 3:23	13:10,	
23:23	Village	15:7,	
typically $4:6$	28:22,	16:10,	< Y >
	29:2, 29:9	16:12,	year 4:9,
	volume 30:15	22:22,	17:23
< U >	volumes 4:12,	23:8,	years 23:11,
undergone	30:20, 31:3	24:21,	23:13,
11:4	voluminous	25:6, 33:6,	31:19,
underground	3:4	33:7, 33:8,	31:20, 32:8
10:12		34:5,	yellow 21:1
understand		35:11,	York 1:25,
24:10, 36:6	< W >	35:12,	37:1, 37:6
unit 8:23	walk 4:2,	35:15,	
units 4:14,	15:5, 26:22	35:17,	
4:19, 6:17,	Walking 29:16	36:1,	< Z >
21:14	wanted 32:8,	36:10,	zoned 9:11
Unless 24:8,	3 3 : 1 2	36:14	zoning 9:3,
28:18,	water 11:1	winds 3:12	9:4, 9:7,
3 4 : 2 1	ways 31:10	wise 18:11	9:14
unmet 28:18	we had 31:22,	WISNIEWSKI	
until 34:6,	32:11,	26:10,	
36:7	36:13	27:15	

Fr	om:
_	

Marrero, Nadine L

Sent:

Monday, July 15, 2019 10:33 AM

To:

Paananen, Jason A

Subject:

FW: Comment on Elmwood crossing project.

Attachments:

Children's Hospital entry pavilion.jpg

From: Anthony James [mailto:anthonyojames@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 10:28 AM

To: Marrero, Nadine L < nmarrero@ch.ci.buffalo.ny.us> **Subject:** Comment on Elmwood crossing project.

Hi Nadine,

While I am in support of the Elmwood Crossing project in general I have one comment that I feel is very important regarding the design. The proposed renderings show a total redesign of the entry pavilion (existing condition shown in photo attached), which is undoubtedly the best Postmodern building in Buffalo. It would be easier (and also cheaper, I'm sure) to retain this facade, which in another 25 or 30 years will have achieved the 50 year mark and if we lose it we will lose the best of that period of modern architecture. Since the planning board does have some design input I would urge that this important building not be lost to posterity. Many thanks for the chance to give input. I will also make these comments for the EIS process. Sincerely,

Anthony James

Anthony O. James, R.A. Anthony O. James, Architect 160 Greenfield Street Buffalo, NY 14214 716-243-1261 anthonyojamesarchitect.com

Virus-free.	www.avast.com



From:

ezwiz@aol.com

Sent:

Monday, July 15, 2019 12:00 PM

To:

Paananen, Jason A

Subject:

Elmwood Crossing

July 15.2019

To: Buffalo Planning Board Subject: Elmwood Crossing

Hello...

I am writing to you with concerns about the looming Elmwood Crossing project.

After reviewing the most current site plan and walking around the block, I have noticed the newly proposed "Nature Art Focused Play Area" and "Open Lawn" space now proposed for the lot at 187 Bryant Street located next to the Alfiero Building.

To achieve this new so called "green space" it would require the demolition of 2 two houses.

This is wrong and uncalled for.

I do not recollect this ever being mentioned before at the many community forums about Elmwood Crossing, where a major request from the majority of residents of the Elmwood Village was for more "Green Space" and a wish for a neighborhood park.

I have watch this plan evolve and it appears that "green space" is becoming smaller as the site is becoming more packed and overdeveloped.

Regardless of what they call it.... or how green they color it on paper.... the requests and major concerns of the neighborhood are being ignored.

Two historic vintage houses on Bryant Street are now in danger of being demolished. Stop this from happening.

Please address this problem and deny this part of the proposal.

Sincerely,

Bill Wisniewski 305 Bryant Street Buffalo

From:

BOSA Buffalo

bosabuffalo@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, July 29, 2019 5:07 PM

To:

Paananen, Jason A

Subject:

Comments on Elmwood Crossing DGEIS

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

To whom it may concern:

The Bryant-Oakland-Summer Block Club wishes to submit the following comments pursuant to the Elmwood Crossing DGEIS.

In general, our group is supportive of this project and wishes to see it proceed apace. A number of our members have participated in the Project Advisory Group for several years, and appreciate the opportunity to provide input and guidance to the development team.

Our comments to the DGEIS are as follows:

- It is our strong belief that the project should include more greenspace. Our area has a dearth of usable public space; parks and playspaces would be of benefit to residents of all ages, existing neighbors and new residents of the Elmwood Crossing development alike. According to the developers, they have provided for as much greenspace as they are willing and able to do independently. Therefore, it is our sincere hope that the City of Buffalo will pursue some kind of public-private partnership to insure and manage such a space to provide an amenity to our community.
- We wish to see creative efforts to mitigate the impacts of construction on the immediate neighbors and on the Elmwood retail strip. For example, the developers could consider a temporary mural on the fencing surrounding the (still vacant) parcel at Elmwood and Bryant.
- Lastly, we are concerned that there's been little progress at the site and wish to see work progress on an expedited timeframe.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in. Carly Battin BOSA Board President

From:

Courtney Bajdas <courtney.bajdas@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, July 28, 2019 7:44 PM

To:

Paananen, Jason A

Subject:

Elmwood Crossing DGEIS

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

Dear Mr. Paananen,

I am the owner and occupant of 227 Anderson Place. Additionally, I am a member of the Elmwood Crossing Project Advisory Committee (PAC) representing my block of Anderson. The below opinions are mine. Other Andersonians will proffer their own.

I have concerns over the Elmwood Crossing DGEIS.

- The grocery store on West Utica has the loading right on W. Utica. This raises major concerns regarding traffic being blocked while trucks maneuver into/out of the loading dock. Watch Elmwood Avenue between Forest and Bryant on any weekday morning between 7am and 9am and you'll see how disruptive it is for pedestrian and vehicular traffic when a delivery truck is trying to access a business. Why not put the grocery store loading dock in the rear where there are presently parking spots? The parking could be shifted to the front of the property.
- The grocery store/lofts building on West Utica is designed as four stories. That is too tall. It should be limited to 3 stories like other new structures in the neighborhood. It should not be taller than the surrounding houses which are 3 stories.
- There is not enough green space. There are plenty of opportunities for more greenery. It benefits the neighborhood, the new Elmwood Crossing residents, the environment and the storm sewers. MORE GREEN SPACE.
- This project, when finished, will dramatically increase the stress on the sewer system. Per the DGEIS the developers have offered to install a detention vessel underneath one swath of green space if, and only if, the planned green space is insufficient. One detention vessel located in a sole location is not reasonable or responsible. This is a real issue and it needs to be addressed before construction begins. As it is, the last two years have seen houses in the neighborhood flooding. The addition of hundreds more people (apartments, townhouses, condos, hotel) and many new businesses is only going to stress the system more.
- The developers have used data that is not representative of the City's demographics. Their "affordable" housing rents are not feasible for most folks. Unless you, the Planning Board, insist, they will not consider lowering the rent of some of the units (there are plenty of market rate units to compensate). You have an opportunity to effect the future of our neighborhood and the lives of low-income residents. You can make this project more inclusive.
- Elmwood Crossing paid for the traffic study that is included in the DGEIS. That is an obvious conflict of interest. The City should do an independent traffic study to eliminate bias. This is a massive project with huge impacts. The City's traffic study should include an engineering traffic simulation model. Parking and traffic are

one of the main concerns of area residents and business owners. The window of opportunity to do this responsibly, i.e. before plans are approved and construction begins, is small.

Finally, Sinatra & Co. and Ellicott Development do not have good track records of listening to residents and other stakeholders. Sure they hold public meetings and collect comment cards, but when it comes down to it, they don't make significant changes.

Two recent examples are:

- The multi-use new build on the corner of Elmwood and Bryant. Green code says 3 stories is the maximum. There was considerable public outcry that the proposed 6-story structure was too tall. The developers "heard" the public and "compromised" by eliminating one floor. That is not what the public demanded. Five stories is closer to their plan than it is to the code.
- The Cadet Cleaners condominium project at West Utica and Atlantic Avenue faced significant pushback regarding the location of the sole driveway for the condos. A petition signed by 120 residents and property owners from within 1/16th of a mile of the project stated they wanted the driveway located on West Utica instead of on Atlantic Avenue. The developer refused to make the change and the driveway remains on Atlantic.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We are counting on you to ensure this monumental project is designed and executed responsibly and with consideration to the historic neighborhood and its residents.

Sincerely, Courtney Bajdas

From:

ALEXANDER L THOMSON < thomsonclan@me.com>

Sent:

Thursday, July 25, 2019 9:21 PM

To:

Paananen, Jason A

Subject:

Elmwwod Crossing project

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up Flagged

Flag Status:

Good Evening,

I am a current homeowner on Hodge Avenue. It is in my estimation, based on the public documents, that the current scale of the Elmwood Crossing is far to large in it's scope for the area. This project should be scaled down, or major changes to current traffic flow on surrounding street and changes in existing parking rules should be planned before the project begins.

The current parking and traffic analysis are not reflective of current conditions, and rely on speculation and underestimation of potential impact for the numbers to work. There needs to be a more comprehensive detailed analysis of the situation.

First off, the overnight parking spots are inadequate now. An elderly neighbor that owns a home on Hodge, near Delaware, had to park on Elmwood Avenue just the other evening because there were no spots available on Hodge. The amount of overnight parking has increased since the departure of children's hospital. The current plan of apartments, condos, hotel workers, retail workers, grocery store workers, and all of the customers brings the potential number of cars to over 800. The parking garage and available spaces are not near adequate, and street parking cannot accomodate the overflow.

The estimated increase in the amount of cars and the existing traffic patterns are implausible. In just one example there are over 200 apartment units, but the stated impact from these apartments is only 56 cars. The traffic study itself does not show trucks of any kind using Hodge. There are trucks travelling up and down Hodge all day long. Hodge is currently used by local drivers as a cut through to avoid traffic lights. The study does not reflect reality, and the impact has been substantially underestimated.

There is a unaccounted for problem with the plans. There are several connectors that are in reality going to become side-streets. The current pass-through under the Alfieri addition, the proposed "driveway" connecting Hodge to the Supermarket parking lot and thus connecting Utica to Hodge, and a potential cut through from the Elmwood exit of the parking ramp through the parking lot behind Casa Di Pizza that is owned by the developer. With the reality of the increase in traffic (that must also include the new townhouses on Utica that are being ignored because they have parking, and another major housing development going across Utica proposed by the same developer) drivers will be looking for ways to "short-circuit" the main arteries and traffic signals. It is very reasonable to presume that there will be a more substantial increase in traffic pressure on Hodge than is anticipated. With this problem the idea of making Hodge a one way, or even a dead-end should be part of the project discussion.

I am also VERY concerned the we are demolition existing housing stock to accommodate green space, when what we should be doing is demolishing existing hard-scape. The proposal is to demolish a Victorian home and carriage garage on Utica to put in a small park space. A better solution would be to remove the parking area next to the Alfieri wing to increase green space, and at the same time eliminating a traffic "short-circuit" onto Hodge.

As for better solutions to the traffic and parking issues there are several things that should be considered. The most obvious is to reduce the number of housing units in the proposal. Increase the volume of street parking in the immediate vicinity. Streets such as Oakland place, Bryant

and St. Goeorge's square have limited or NO parking. Oakland Place has no overnight parking. Also all streets in the immediate area should change to permit parking on both sides of the street.

In summary please consider:

- 1. Completing a detailed traffic and parking report that is accurately represents current conditions. This one does not.
- 2. Reduce the number of units because of the impacts to the immediate area due to traffic, parking and congestion.
- 3. Increase the amount of parking spaces on the immediate vicinity, especially underutilized streets such as Oakland Place.
- 4. Make local street parking on both sides to increase capacity.
- 5. Make Hodge a dead-end to reduce its use as a work-around for current traffic, if not at least a one-way.
- 6. Don't remove existing housing stock, and obtain green space by eliminating blacktop, particularly the Alfieri parking spots adjacent to Hodge (which would also eliminate it as a work-around as stated in #5

Thank you for you consideration, Alex Thomson 55 Hodge Ave

From:

Bill Smeltz <wsmeltz@gmail.com>

Sent:

Thursday, July 25, 2019 8:02 AM

To:

Paananen, Jason A

Subject:

Elmwood Crossing EIS Comment

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

In review of the Environmental Impact Study, please note the following comments:

- There are inconsistencies in the site plan drawings between the Bergman Traffic Study and the Master Plan Site Plans as to documentation of the North/South circulation serving the East side of the Gallagher Ramp. The Traffic Study shows two-way North/South circulation to the parking garage. This configuration appears to not result in a through-the-block circulation pattern. The Master Plan shows continuous circulation between Utica and Hodge Avenue in the Southbound direction. The Master Plan should clarify whether there is an intent to provide through circulation in a North/South direction between West Utica and Hodge Avenue. Please note that the traffic studies refer to the Hodge connection as a parking garage driveway. This terminology and the resulting traffic flow calculations would be inconsistent with the development of two-way through circulation which for all practical purposes would create a new through-the-block street running North/South along the East edge of the Gallagher Ramp. We believe the Planning Board and city traffic officials should require clarification of the real intent and understand the impact on internal development circulation, as well as the impact on West Utica and Hodge Avenue circulation. The developers should also clarify what assumptions were used in the calculation and the conclusions of the Bergman Report.
- The Plan represents that paid parking in the Gallagher Ramp will support parking for the apartment occupancy of the development. The failure to provide adequate free parking to the apartments will result in competition for free street parking throughout the impact area as new residents attempt to avoid paid parking. Consideration for a mechanism to provide resident's parking or to include parking within the rental structure of the new apartments, as well as other alternatives, should be considered to avoid negative impact on the adjacent neighborhoods as residents rely on street parking for much of their parking capacity.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Bill Smeltz 65 Hodge Avenue

From:

joel <jlippes@gmail.com>

Sent:

Wednesday, July 24, 2019 2:06 PM

To:

Paananen, Jason A

Subject:

ELMWOOD CROSSING DGEIS COMMENTS

Follow Up Flag:

Follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

To: Jason Paananen, Dir. Environmental Planning

re: Elmwood Crossing DGEIS

Dear Jason,

After studying the DGEIS, looking at the maps and traffic patterns, I have two concerns:

- 1. The traffic flows shown suggest they'll affect Hodge Avenue more than is indicated. For one thing, the "driveways" being proposed are in fact roads connecting Hodge to West Utica and to Bryant. With the proposed supermarket, expanded day care, and a busier parking ramp Hodge is likely to become a traffic "dumping ground" and kind of a back door access route. Hodge, historically a quiet street (even with the hospital operating), is threatened with excess traffic, insufficient parking, and noise.
- 2. The map of Elmwood Crossing indicates new "green space" on Bryant, adjacent and east of the hospital. That green space would require demolition of two lovely residences (one formerly used for hospital offices), both of which are in good shape. The city and the developers must be made aware that this neighborhood will vigorously fight to preserve these homes, both of which are architecturally consistent with the rest of the neighborhood.

Here's the bottom line of my concerns: The developers are proposing an extremely, overly dense residential/commercial project. The impact of this development will be potentially harmful to the immediate neighborhood, not to mention the "Elmwood Village" as a whole.

The project, because of the strong possibility of negative impacts, must be significantly scaled down. And, if demolition is to occur for (much needed) green space then some part(s) of the obsolete hospital are much better suited to be torn down.

Yours truly, Joel Lippes 35 Hodge Buffalo 14222

OTHER CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED (Outside of the GEIS process)



Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation

ANDREW M. CUOMO Governor

ROSE HARVEY
Commissioner

May 16, 2018

Mr. Jason Paananen City of Buffalo 901 City Hall, 65 Niagara Square Buffalo, NY 14202

Re:

NPS

Elmwood Crossing Major Subdivision Project

187 & 219 Bryant Street, 125 Hodge Avenue, 451 & 489 Elmwood Avenue, 180, 184 &

188 West Utica Street, Buffalo, Erie County, NY

18PR02821

Dear Mr. Paananen:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). We have reviewed the provided documentation in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. These comments are those of the SHPO and relate only to Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include other environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and/or the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8).

The Archaeological Survey, SUNY-Buffalo (UB) prepared a Phase IA Sensitivity Assessment report for a previously reviewed project encompassing the above noted project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). Based upon our review of that report entitled "Phase IA Archaeological Resources Sensitivity Assessment for the Proposed Improvements to Women and Children's Hospital, City of Buffalo, Erie County, New York" (Montague May 2009), the recommendations contained therein and the proposed current undertaken, the SHPO offers the following Phase IB archaeological testing recommendations:

- 1. Phase IB 7.5-meter (25 feet) shovel test intervals is recommended in areas of low predicted disturbance that may be impacted by the proposed project. See green shaded areas in enclosed Figure 11 (page 19) of the Phase IA Report for these locations.
- 2. Phase IB testing is recommended for the areas of impact related to the proposed Grocery Store with Apartments Above, and the Townhouse complex south of West Utica Street, as they correspond to the areas marked in yellow on the attached Figure 11.
- 3. Phase IB archaeological testing is **not** recommended for the remainder of the project APE.

...2

Mr. Jason Paananen May 16, 2018 Page 2 of 3.

The above testing protocol is acceptable to our office with the understanding that the consulting archaeologist will be supplied with a set of accurate project construction plans before proceeding with Phase IB archaeological testing.

Our office does not conduct cultural resources surveys. A 36 CFR 61 qualified archaeologist should be retained to undertake the Phase I survey. Many archaeological consulting firms advertise their availability in the yellow pages. The services of qualified archaeologists can also be obtained by contacting local, regional, or statewide professional archaeological organizations. Phase I surveys can be expected to vary in cost per mile of right-of-way or by the number of acres impacted. We encourage you to contact a number of consulting firms and compare examples of each firm's work to obtain the best product.

Please also be aware that a Section 233 permit from the New York State Education Department (SED) may be necessary before any archaeological survey activities are conducted on State-owned land. If any portion of the project includes the lands of New York State, you should contact the SED before initiating survey activities. The SED contact is Dr. Christina Reith and she can be reached at (518) 402-5975. Section 233 permits are not required for projects on private land.

Finally, please verify all state and/or federal agencies that are now or will be involved in this project in the future and from which you will be receiving permits, permissions and/or funding, and provide the SHPO with the contact names and addresses, including email, for each involved agency.



Figure 11. Predicted areas of disturbance in the project area. Green represents areas of lowest predicted disturbance, yellow represents areas of moderate disturbance, and red represents areas of high disturbance.

Mr. Jason Paananen May 16, 2018 Page 3 of 3.

If further correspondence is required regarding this project, please refer to the project number (PR) noted above. If you have any questions, I can be reached at 518-268-2218 or via e-mail at Josalyn.Ferguson@parks.ny.gov.

Sincerely,

Josalyn Ferguson (B.A., M.A.)

Historic Preservation Specialist/Archaeology

via e-mail only

c.c. Nadine Marrero, City of Buffalo

c.c. Sean Hopkins, Hopkins Sorgi & Romanowski



Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation

ANDREW M. CUOMO
Governor

ROSE HARVEY
Commissioner

September 6, 2019

OUTDATED

Mr. Jason Paananen Director of Environmental Affairs City of Buffalo 901 City Hall 65 Niagara Square Buffalo, NY 14202

Re:

NPS. DEC

Elmwood Crossing Major Subdivision Project

187 & 219 Bryant Street, 125 Hodge Avenue, 451 & 489 Elmwood Avenue, 180, 184 &

188 West Utica Street, Buffalo, Erie County, NY

18PR02821

Dear Mr. Paneen:

Thank you for providing additional information to the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). We have reviewed the submitted materials in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

I put the project on hold while I waited for you to provide me with a Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) contact. When you provided me with that contact information through email, I did not remember that the project was on hold and did not reopen it and provide my comments. When I received your call today, I realized what had happened. I am sorry that you did not receive these comments when we intended to provide them.

The proposed action consists of major subdivision approval for the combination of a portion of 187 and 219 Bryant Street, the combination of 180, 184 & 188 West Utica Street and the combination of a portion of 219 Bryant Street and 451 Elmwood Avenue for the recently approved Elmwood Crossing mixed-use project. Creation of these parcels is in connection with the future mixed-use redevelopment of the Children's Hospital site and other nearby parcels.

As previously indicated by our office in our May 16, 2018 letter, the SHPO has archaeological cultural resource concerns with the Elmwood Crossing Major Subdivision Project. These concerns and our recommendations for a Phase IB Archaeological Subsurface Survey were not reflected in the Draft Scoping Document. We wish to again draw attention to our concerns, and recommendation for the Phase IB Archaeological Survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Josalyn Ferguson of the Division of Historic Preservation's Archaeology Unit at 518.268.2218, or Josalyn.Ferguson@parks.ny.gov.

There are a number of historic buildings proposed for demolition as part of the project. The demolition of these structures will have an Adverse Effect. As we noted in our June 8, 2018 letter, we are particularly concerned with 184 West Utica Street because of the uniqueness and quality. We recommend that the historic properties proposed for demolition be retained and that they not be demolished. However, if that cannot be done, we request that particular attention be paid to saving or moving 184 West Utica Street. We also recommend that our office be consulted with as the project materials are developed so that we can determine the impact the project will have on the multiple historic structures in the Area of Potential Effect (APE).

If I can be of further assistance, please contact me at 518-268-2158.

Sincerely,

Sloane Bullough

Historic Sites Restoration Coordinator

Sloane Bullough

via e-mail only



ANDREW M. CUOMO Governor ERIK KULLESEID Commissioner

October 4, 2019

Mr. Jason Paananen, Director of Environmental Affairs City of Buffalo 901 City Hall 65 Niagara Square Buffalo, NY 14202

Re: SEQRA

Elmwood Crossing Major Subdivision Project 187 Bryant Street, 125 Hodge Avenue, 451 & 489 Elmwood Avenue, 180, 184 & 188 West Utica Street, Buffalo, Erie County, NY 18PR02821.008

Dear Mr. Paananen:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Division for Historic Preservation of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) as part of your SEQRA process. These comments are those of the Archaeology Unit of OPRHP and are intended to clarify our office's position regarding concerns for Archaeological Historic/Cultural resources that may be impacted by the proposed project. They do not include potential environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617).

As per our May 16, 2018 letter, a Phase IA Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment report was previously completed by SUNY-Buffalo's Archaeological Survey (Mongague May 2009) that covers the proposed project's Area of Potential Effects. Following the recommendations made in that report and in light of the Elmwood Crossing Major Subdivision Project's ground disturbing impacts, OPRHP noted in our letter that our office has concerns for potential impacts to archaeological cultural resources. These concerns and specific recommendations for a Phase IB Archaeological Subsurface Survey were not reflected in the Draft Scoping Document submitted to our office for review. OPRHP thus wishes to draw attention to our concerns and continued recommendation for a Phase IB Archaeological Survey. The Phase IB Archaeological Survey Report can be submitted to our office for review and comment using the following Cultural Resource Information System (CRIS) link:

https://cris.parks.ny.gov/?type=CR&id=41DNT4YTKKTQ.

Ms. Sloane Bullough of OPRHP's Technical Unit will similarly be providing clarifying comments about concerns for above ground, structural historic/cultural resources under separate cover.

If this project will involve state or federal permitting, funding or licensing, it may require a more rigorous review by those agencies and this office for potential impacts to architectural and archaeological resources, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act or Section 14.09 of NYS Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation Law.

Mr. Jason Paananen October 4, 2019 Page 2.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (518) 268-2218 or via e-mail at <u>Josalyn.Ferguson@parks.ny.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Josalyn Ferguson, Ph.D. Scientist Archaeology

via e-mail only

- c.c. Andrew Reilly, Wendel Companies
- c.c. David Denk, DEC
- c.c. Kerry Traynor, kta Preservation Specialists
- c.c. Nadine Marrero, City of Buffalo
- c.c. Sean Hopkins, Hopkins Sorgi & Romanowski